G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

File No. 143

1920.

(Misc)

Serial Nos.

1-7

Later references.

1921 Vol 4, 6, 8 10.

1-17

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for January 21

SUBJECT.

Appeal petn of Bhuvana Setty & certain others of Gokak Agriculturists Mahajan Gokak re appointment of a Pujari

---

Petn No 2567 Dy 4.1.21

Informed that the matter has been forwarded to the Dy Comm

WD 2283 -GPB -20,000—14-6-20

G. R. S. 11] 1912

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Miscl)

NOTES

File No. 143/1920

FILE HEADING.

Archakship of Kalle Byreshwara temple of Chikkanahalakere Village in the Malavalli Taluk

From

Bhaira Setti and Others

— No. Petition Dated Received 4/9/20

Diary No. 599	Enclos 2	Spare Copies. —	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Appeals against the Dy. Commr's order directing that an election should be held in accordance with the Rules under Sec. 15 of the Inam Rules for the selection of a Pujari, as the previous hereditary trustee has ceased to function, and state that they are hereditary trustees and pray for an interim order directing stay of execution of the Dy. Commr's order pending disposal of the appeal.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

The petition is duly stamped. A copy of the Dy. Comrs. order appealed against, is produced. The Dy. Commissioner's order is dated 17-8-20 and the appeal was presented on 16-9-20 i.e. within time. Submitted for orders whether a report should be called for?

AA? 18/9/20 18/9/20

NOTES—First Sheet.

GPB—20/1000—8-11

I. R S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Mesq File No/43 of 1920

Serial No.

For orders —

The The order against which the appeal was preferred to the Mamlatdar is confirmed & the case when in charge of malversation of Dr. —

Asst. —
24/9/20.

Reply ?

Telegram sent Asst
Register called in 24/25/9/20
Asst 28/9

DD Executive
rec'd 25 9 20 84
30/9/20 Done Asst 6/10/20

2. To, Mg. Commr. for ...
No. 1449 Dt. 26.10.20.
forwards Petition of ... for ...
Register Inspection and Record

3. From Mgr. Vaibhav ... for ...
Petition ... for ...
Consolidation Act ...
Case after ... when ...
Register ...

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat. | No. , File No. of 19

Serial No.

appellant from the [illegible]
of which they were in pos[illegible]
from [illegible] that the [illegible]
the [illegible]
[illegible].

The Dy. Commr. order
appealed against that in the
matter of the election of a Pujari,
an election should be held in
accordance with the Rule under
Sec. 35 of the [illegible] Regulation.
In the appeal petition, they had
asked for an interim order staying
stay of execution of the order appealed
against, but a [illegible] bill cost
has been called for which
has not been [illegible]
[illegible] the appellee
[illegible] ained a previous [illegible]
[illegible] copy of the order from
which that the appeal be [illegible]
in [illegible]
[illegible]

18/11/20 — The Dr may be asked to submit this report

Dy. Commr. 19.11.20

Worry).

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 143 of 19 20

Serial No.

Petr may be asked to produce a Copy of the Order complained of if it is different from the Order and if there is no he may be asked to state on oath as to what has taken and with what result

A.C. for 19/11/20

AMT 19-11-20

DD. Submitted

22-11-20

22/11/20 — AMT 26/11/20

(I agree)

AMT 26/11/20

4

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Judl File No. 143 of 1922

Serial No 5

From, the Dy Comr, Tuticorin
Letter No 36 dt 6-12-22

Submits the entire file of records connected with the case.

No facts of the case are stated at sufficient length in the Dy Commr's order dt 1-12-22 the date of the appeal appears.

May the appeal be posted for hearing?

Submitted for orders.

1/1
25/12

180
27/12

The dispute relates to the Pujaridhip of Kalle Bairi Devan Temple in Chick Aramkere village.

The Dy Comr has decided that a Pujari should be appointed by election under the rules framed under Sec 35 of the Madras Religious Sec 35 would apply to cases where there is

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Inner File No. 143 of 1920

Serial No.

No Claimant but # in the present Case there are dual p... claiming the office and Cover... Sec 35 is inapplicable. It is the duty of the Muzzai officer decide which of the two rival Claimants is better entitled the office.

Further the rules relied upon by the Commr relate ... to matters "not in the direct Management of the Muzzai dept" but the Temple in Question is a Muz institution and Consequently under the direct Management Govt.

May the appeal posted for hearing and the D.C requested to keep in abeyance his order pending the decision of a Puisne Judge (Board Member)

3657-5
7 1 21

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

The case must be remanded to the ... Court for ... in the light of the observations ... Appeal ... Sec.

10-1-21

[H R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Rev. File No. 143 of 19 21

Serial No.	
	D.O. Section [illegible]
	[illegible]
	15-1-21
	17-1-21
	Issue of 17/1/21
	An endorsement should be issued to Secretary 17/1/21
	D.O. Cust & Industries
	[illegible]
	18-1-21
	19/1/21 Issue of Advice
6.	To, D.C. Surma
	No. 2765 dt 14.1.1921
	Remand the case of [illegible] for [illegible]
	of [illegible] & disposal
	To, Khairabetia Station Clerk Blackmore
	No. 2667 dt 14.1.1921
	Receipt of [illegible]

NOTE—Contn. sheet



599

20-21

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

In the Muzarai Department.

Muzarai Mislleneous Appeal /20-21

1. Bhairasetty of Bamahally
2. Lingasetty son of Bhairasetty.
3. Lingasetty son of Chamasetty.

residing at Chikkarasinakere village of the Malavalli Taluq Mysore District.

Appellants (respondent before the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore.)

VERSUS.

1. Lingegowda of Arasinakere Malavalli Taluq.
2. Siddegowda of Arekaldoddi, Malavalli Taluq.
3. Siddalingayya of Ajjahalli Mandya Taluq.
4. Siddegowda of Honnanayakanahally Malvalli Taluq.

Respondents (appellants before the Deputy Commissioner.)

The appellants above-named beg most respectfully to prefer this appeal from the order passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, dated the 17th August 1920, in Muzarai Appeal Petition No.169 of 18-19 on the following amongst other grounds, viz.,

1. The learned Deputy Commissioner having considered it inadvisable to allow the appeal filed before him by the respondents, erred in directing that an election should be held in accordance with the rules framed under section 35 of the Muzarai Regulation.

2. The respondents have no locus standi in the matter as the Assistant Commissioner incharge has clearly held that they have no right to be parties to the suit in question and as the Deputy Commissioner has not disturbed that finding.

3. The lower Court erred in applying the provisions of section 35 of the Muzarai Regulation, as the appellants are themselves claimants entitled to succeed to the office of Pujari of the Temple in question and as their suit to enforce this claim is still pending before the Assistant Commissioner in charge of the Malavalli Taluq.

4. The documentary evidence clearly shows that the appellants are the persons in possession of the Pujari Inamati Lands, from the time of their ancestors and that the observation made by the Amildar in his report that till the Inam settlement the Inam lands stood in the name of ~~one~~ one Sivachar Chennayya is clearly incorrect.

5. The appellants have already placed very satisfactory evidence before the Assistant Commissioner on whose file the suit in pending, showing that the appellants are entitled to the Pujarishipp of the temple.

6. The order under appeal is against the facts and the weight of the evidence already adduced in the case.

7. The order is also against law and equity.

The appellants pray most respectfully, therefore, that the order of the Deputy Commissioner may be set aside.

They further pray that pending the disposal of this appeal the execution of the order in question may be directed to be stayed.

Advocate for appellants.

In the Court of the Before the Govt. of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore at Bangalore

Munsiff's CASE NO. OF 1920.—1921

Appellant/Plaintiff. *Respondent/Defendant.*

Byrasetty & others | Vs. | Linge Gowda & others

1. We the applts. above named do, by these presents, retain MR. K. SHANKARA NARAYANA RAU, M. A., B.L., *Advocate* & B. Shankara Rao of Mysore to appear and conduct the above case on our behalf to judgment.

2. We further empower him to do all necessary acts in the above case, to execute any decree or order that may be passed in our behalf and to receive from the Court all documents, refunds, and all sums of money that we may be entitled to get and grant receipts therefor.

3. We also undertake to confirm and ratify all the acts done by the said Advocate or by any other Advocate on his behalf in so doing.



BANGALORE
2/9/ 1920.

Accepted.

Advocate

Personally known to me and signed in my presence

In the Court of the Deputy Commissioner Mysore Dist

Present:— P. H. Bowring Esqr. J. P.
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

Dated - 17th August 1920.

Inam Appeal petition No: 169 of 1918-19.

Appellants.

1. Kempegowda
of Arasinakere
2. Siddegowda
of Arekaladoddi
3. Sidda Kempaiya
of Ajjahally
4. Siddegowda
of Honnamayakana halli

Respondents

1. Bhairasetty
of Bommanahally
2. Kempa Setty
son of Bhairasetty
3. Kempa Setty
son of Chennisetty
of Chikkarasinakere

(all of Malavally Taluk).

vs

Facts of the case

This is a case relating to the right of worship in the Temple of Kattle Byredevaru of Chikkarasinkere village Malavally Taluk.

2. The present appellants as well as one Channama presented a petition on 6-11-1914 to the Deputy Comm.

Mysore, stating that for some time past the present
Respondents, and before them, some others of Banajigar
caste were worshipping the Linga in the said Temple, that
as these did not perform their duties to the satisfaction
of the devotees, they were removed from the Pujari ship
and one Bheemanna, (the above petitioner) a Brahmin,
was appointed by the appellants as Pujari temporarily, and
prayed for such orders being issued in the matter of appointing
a permanent pujari of Sivachar caste (as proposed by the
devotees and dharmadarsee) as per long standing local
custom, as the several duties such as carrying Nandi
Kambha, Kaikkala Karadi, Veerabhadrana Halage &c,
cannot be done by a Pujari belonging to a sect other
than that of Sivachar &c.

The petition was referred to the Amildar of Malavalli,
Taluk for enquiry and report.

The Amildar, in submitting his report states that
the Inam lands endowed to the Temple, was till the
Inam settlement in Sivachar Bheemaiya's name, which
goes to show that a Sivachar was the worshipper in
former days, and that there was no record forthcoming
to show clearly how the right of performing puja had
come to the Banajigars.

In the meantime, there were several petitions from
the devotees residing in the villages round about, to the
effect that Sivachars were the worshippers from time
immemorial, these worshippers having died, and
there being none fit for the post among the living
Sivachars then, the Brahmins of Chikkarasinakere

joined together and appointed by force the Banajigars as Pujaris against their will etc.

These petitions were also referred to the Amildar for detailed enquiry and report. The Amildar held a regular enquiry and submitted his report on 20-5-17 to the Assistant Commissioner Incharge of Malavalli Taluk recommending that under the circumstances stated therein, a Sivachar Pujari may be allowed to be appointed in place of the present temporary Brahmin Pujari as prayed for by the devotee

II

As no early orders were passed on this, the devotee petitioner both to the Amildar and Assistant Commissioner Incharge of Malavalli Taluk praying for orders in the matter of appointing a Pujari to the Temple in question. A regular enquiry was again ordered. During the enquiry by the Amildar, the Vakkaligars, Kapala Kshatriyas, Kumbars, Oholeia, Besters, Panchamas and all, in their statements before him, stated that,

I Byre Devaru is their family God;

II that the worship in the temple was being conducted by Sivachar people,

III about 40 years ago one Shamanaiya of Sivachar caste was the Pujari of the Temple,

IV that this Shamanaiya who went to his native place Bellur, not having returned in time, the head-men of the Temple appointed Ningaseth, some Shamaseth, and Siddaveerappa

as pujaris,

V. that these and their descendants continued to do the duties.

VI. and that when one of these was entangled in a murder case, he was excommunicated but the remaining pujaris used to mix with him.

VII. and in general other misdeeds committed by the above having come to the notice of the Rajamans, they thought it wise to allow such persons to worship the god.

VIII. and that with the help of a decree obtained against them in the Munsiffs court at Seringapatam, the Temple was got possession of by the present appellant with the properties belonging thereto and one Bheemana a Brahmin (above named) was kept as pujari temporarily.

(Vide Rajmana rendered by the Banajigars before the Civil Court in respect of the pujari ship etc of the Temple)

As the Brahmin pujari was averse to carry the Gandi Kamba and perform other attendant ceremonies, some Vaishnava priests were hired these purposes for a time. But they latter, later on refused to perform these functions unless the worship inside the temple was also entrusted to them. At about the same time the Brahmin pujari complained that some temple properly had been stolen from the premises and stopped worship as the Temple became desecrated etc.

Now the prayer of the Gowdas is to be given a poojari

like the hak is declared. Even in making a temporary arrangement, the Ramajigas insist upon having a Brahmin Pujari as they state that they will not take prasadam from one of any other caste, the Gowda as object to a Brahmin because he will not perform all the duties that devolve on the Pujari.

Under these circumstances the Assistant Commissioner Incharge of Malavally Taluk ordered on 2-9-1916 that the question of appointing a Poojari must be held in abeyance until the suit before him in the same connection is decided or until a person acceptable to both the sides is selected.

In the meantime, Byresetty the first respondent presented a petition on 11-6-17 before the Assistant Commissioner Incharge of Malavally Taluk to the effect that the land endowed to the Temple in question bearing Survey No: 264/2 measuring 1-9/12 and assessed at Rs.2-8-0 was in possession and enjoyment of his family for the past two generations who had also the right to worship in the said temple, that this land was equally divided among the three cousins of the family each doing his duty for four months in a year, that when the petitioner's turn fell on 24 11/12 June 1914, he went to take charge of Temple but he was prevented by doing so by Thimmanna above named, who by force, took charge of the Temple with properties and gradually even the Inam land was taken possession of by him. He further urged that he may be declared as Hakdar to worship his God and that the Inam land be restored to him.

Similarly the sons of the original Ramajiga, ... files a suit against the Brahmin poojari ...

that the Poojaiship being hereditary, their father's resignation was not binding on them and that they should be appointed as poojaris &c.

While this was under enquiry the appellants also lodged a petition on 14-7-17 and 14-9-17 before the same office to show that their ancestors and they are the rejamans or Dharmadarsees of the Temple from time immemorial, having right to appoint pujaris, to show how they had once introduced Banajigars for pujariship, how they removed them in 1914 and how a Brahmin was temporarily appointed in the place &c. As only the Brahmin poojari and the present respondents' family were concerned in the above suit, the applicants prayed that under the circumstances represented above, they may also be taken as parties to the case.

The petitions were admitted as Supplemental defendants.

The case was enquired into by the Assistant Commissioner Incharge of Malavalli Taluk. An extract of the Inam Grant Register relating to the endowment has been obtained and filed with the records. Some exhibits were filed by the plaintiffs and defendants, (the present respondents and appellants respectively).

Having enquired into the case, the Assistant Commissioner in charge of Malavalli Taluk passed orders on 3rd Nov. 1919 to the following effect.

The first and original defendant Bhimanna does not lay any claim to the right to the poojariship and he has no objection to give it up. Thus so far as Bhimanna is concerned there can be no suit against him.

Regarding claim of supplemental defendants to the Rajamanike they have not presented any authority in support of their claim. The temple being a Muzrai Institution, the Rajamanike or Manager ship can be recognized in the absence of express samanad or valid orders. They therefore have no status to figure as such.

3. Re the rigul of Bhyrasetty (1st Respondent) to the Poojari ship of the temple, the Amildar has been directed to hold a local enquiry in the matter and dispose of the claim on it. merits.

It is against this order that the petitioners have preferred an appeal before this Court.

The record was called for from the taluk and on perusal it was ordered on 30-4-19 that pending final decision of the case the services of the Brahmin Poojari who was hitherto working may be utilized.

On 14-6-20 a petition was received from Kirigegowda and Puttegowda of Lebbikarasinakere that the pujari (Brahmin) subsequently refused to conduct puja and prayed for orders directing the appointment of a temporary poojari of Sivachar caste. The petition was referred to the Amildar on 14-6-20 for enquiry, disposal and report.

The Amildar held an enquiry and ordered on 17-7-20 the appointment of a Sivachar priest as a temporary measure, and submitted his report to this effect, as called for.

The step taken by the Amildar in appointing a Sivachar priest was objected to by the 2nd set of Lebbikarasinakere on 15-7-20 and a stay order was

Therefore issued till the present appeal is decided

Order

Heard Mrs. Venkatapathiah for the appellants and Messrs: Rama Rao, Lakshmi narasappa and Mr. Rangappiah for Mr. A. Ramanna.

This question has been argued before me at some length and I consider it inadvisable to allow the appeal, but as an executive order is necessary as the parties will never come to any agreement otherwise I direct that an election for pujari take place as laid down in Section 35 of the Rules under the Muzrai Regulation VI of 1913 which will be found in page 15 part III of the Mysore Gazette of January 14th, 1915.

Mysore
17-8-20.

Signed / P. H. Bowring
Deputy Commissioner.

"Copy"

By Order
Muzrai Assistant
Muzrai Department.

Copy applied on 18-8-20
Copy ready on 23-8-20
Copy delivered on 23-8-20.
Number of words 1505

S.VI—G/32]

A217

SUBJECT:—

Diary No. of letter replied to

Section

File No. 143-20

Serial No. 2

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT,

( )

, the 191

No. 1649.

Date of issue 26 10 1920

Signed by Ewr AH Ayes

To

The Dy Commr

Insp Genl of Pols

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for favour of an early report with reference to petition regd no 599 from Baidea Sethi and others applying against grant of fee

Directing that an election may be held in accordance with the Rules under Sec 30 of the Bombay Regn in Re

917 Aug 1920.

matter of the selection of a
Pujari to Kalle Bire Devaru
temple at Chikkaviadaia-
kere village, Malavalli Taluk,
and advancing their hereditary
claims to the Archa-
ship in dispute

Thanking you

Yours faithfully

Secretary

20/9/20

Presented before - urgent 16.10.20 ag 16.10.20

143-20

3

Before the Government of His Highness the Maha
of Mysore at Bangalore.

Miscellaneous Appeal No. /'20-'21.

Appellants:--

Sri Sheety and others:--

Versus.

Respondents:--

Sri Govinda and others:--

The appellants above named beg to state as follows:--

The appellants above named have preferred the above appeal from the order of the Deputy Commissioner of Kadur in Appeal No. 109 of 1918-1919 on his file confirming --- in the matter of the pujarishipof the temple of Kattebyradevaru of Chikkaranga-kere, Malvalli Taluq

inter alia that the order is not sustainable --- and praying that the same may be set aside.

The said order of the Deputy Commissioner is liable to be set aside for the reasons set forth in the memorandum of appeal in greater detail.

In the meantime, however, the said Govinda and others who do not belong to the --- village and who are not even residents of the pujarishipare trying to oust the appellants from the pujarishipof which they are in possession and are trying to gain a position to which they

entitled in order to harass the ---
appellants and put them to serious inconvenience
and loss.

[illegible] the ---
[illegible] to [illegible] serious
[illegible] to the appellants.
[illegible], [illegible] and [illegible] of
[illegible] the order of the
[illegible] to be directed to the

W. Strachan
Mackenzie

Tu

ಟೂ ತಿರುಗು TWO RUPE ಟೂ-೪

Before the Govt of Ht. the Maha Raja of Mysore
(Mysore) ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

appeal agst the order of the Dy Comr Mysore No 164 18-19 dt 17-aug 20

19—19—ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ನಂಬರು.

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜೀದಾರ್.

1 ಬೈರಪ್ಪಳ್ಳಿ

2 ಅಂಕಪ್ಪಳ್ಳಿ

3 ಅಂಕಪ್ಪಳ್ಳಿ

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪ್ಪೋನೆಂಟ್.

ಅಂಕಪ್ಪಗವರು

ಮಾ|| ರಾ|| ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್ ಸಿ. ಕೃಷ್ಣರಾವ್ ಬಿ.ಎ., ಬಿ.ಎಲ್ ರವರಿಗೆ.

ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ವಾದಿಗಳು ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮಾ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಆಖ್ಯೈರುವರುವಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರಗಿಸುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಹೊಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಹೊಬಲಗು ರೀಫಂಡು ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು ಹೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಧೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮುತ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಹೊಪದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇಧೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು 18.12.20 } ರುಜು

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

C. Krishna Rao
Advocate

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇಧೇನೆ.

Accepted
C. Krishna Rao
Advocate,
18.12.20

Sri Venkatesa Press Bangalore City 1919

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to———

Section Prog (a)
File No. 443-2
Serial No 7.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, the 191

Date of issue———

To

Signed by———

with ref. to the application
regd. no. 893 of 16th Oct 20
preferred in behalf of Enige
Gowda and others praying
that pending disposal of
the appeal, the execution
of the Dy Commr's order
placing the respondents
in possession of the
Archakship of Kalle
Byre Devaru &
chikkanayaka & K. Gowda
over. Jakkur.

may be stayed, Messrs.
K. Shankara Narayana Rao
and B. Shankara Rao, Advocates,
are informed requested to
produce a copy of the
order complained of,
if it is different from
the order appealed against
and if there is no such
order, stating whether an election
has taken place and with
what result.

V.P. 21/4/20

Secretary

Dy. Regr
22/4/20

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

A.2c



1920-21.

From The Deputy Commissioner
Nyeri District.

To The Secretary
to the Government of the
Kenya Colony & Protectorate
Nairobi

Dated 4th December 1920.

Despatched

Received 7 DEC 1920

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

Re Circl. Lands relating to the
Selection of a Site for the
Native Location

No.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.
Dated, Mysore, 4th ~~November~~ December 1930.

From

P.F. Bowring, Esquire,
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

T.L. Jayarama Iyer, Esquire, M.A.,B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Huzur Department, Bangalore.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No.L.1.19, Huz.1 dated the 26th October 1930 requiring for report with records a petition from Pyla Thimmappa Naik preferred against my order of the 17th August 1930 in respect of the right of worship in the temple of Kattey Gangamma of Chikkanahalli village, Malavalli Taluk, I have the honor to forward herewith the files of records relating to the case and to state that the facts of the case will be clear from a perusal of the preamble to the order passed by me on the 17th August 1930.

The appeal petition together with its enclosures received with your letter under reply are returned herewith.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

For Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

G.R.S. VI–71]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to... 1228

18

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* 191 .

Date of issue..... 24.1.21

Signed by..... Mr. J. L. Finch

Section

File No. 145

Serial No. 6820

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of **Mysore.**

Read–

Petition rept. no 599 of 10th September 1920 from Bhanu Setty and certain others of Chikkanasinkere in the Malavalli Taluk appearing against the Mysore Dharmic Endowments Regulation, 1920 praying that the Pujaris of the temple of Kalle Byrava Devaru in the village Shanbhoganahalli may be exempted from the operation of certain rules framed under certain

May this be

i Printed ?

ii treated as a standing order ?

iii published in the Gazette, English Part ?

iv translated ?

v placed at the disposal of the press ?

vi published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

Order Thereon No.

of the Imperial Registrar.

Correspondence ending
with letter No. D. 2 &
6th December 1920 from
the Dy. Comm. Income
Tax., respecting the
above

Under Section - 25 - Income Tax Act 1918 - 143-20-6.
D 24 - 1 21

Our firm's opinion was
would differ
Section 35 ~~was applicable~~ only
in case where there is
no claimant, but in the
present case, there are
rival parties claiming
the fee and consequently
Sec. 35 is inapplicable. In
addition the Rules which
apply by the Dy. Comm.
state only to institution
& not under the direct
management of

Inst of enclosures.

Copied by ~~the~~ ~~clerk~~ ~~of~~ the

Examined by ~~Head~~ ~~Clerk~~
of them

WD 1744—GPB—30,000—17-3-19

Out of both of them
Hindu have claims
which of them is
letter referred to a

G. R. S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

File No.

Serial No. 7

Diary No. of letter replied to ...1224...

No. 2547

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, the 191 .

Date of issue 9/1

Signed by...

To

Endorsement granted to
Bhima Setty and certain other
Cultivators Ryotwar in the
Malvalli Taluk (through Mr
K Shankara Narayana Rao vide
his ref. to their petition regd on
5th Feb 1918
appealing against the Order
by Commissioner, directing
the appointment of a Panchayat
for deciding the Kaste Boye
Dewans in the Villages of
Byrapatna in said Taluk

over.

SUBJECT.

framed under Sec. 35 of the Act.

Regulation.

In reply, we beg to be informed that the matter is to be examined by Commissioner [illegible], for further enquiry and disposal. ~~With the aforesaid that Sec 3~~ ~~of the Act, he is not~~ ~~to the case in hand~~

[illegible]

[illegible]

18/1/21

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

G f B 20,000– 10.10 14